# California Water Plan, 2013 Update
# Plenary Session

Technology Caucus

David Zoldoske

Bob Wilkinson

Karl Longley

# Phase I Activities

I-1. Identify basic technologies and research areas upon which to focus

I-2. Identify appropriate "area knowledge experts" within these technologies and broader survey recipient list

I-3. Develop appropriate on-line questionnaires

I-4. Administer the questionnaires

I-5. Prepare online database of responses

I-6. Review online database of responses

I-7. Summary document of survey findings from database

## Phase II Activities

II-1. Map the technologies identified in Phase I

II-2. Continue administering online survey

II- 3 Make individual follow up calls

II-4. Summarize results

II-5. Focus Group Activities

- Preplanning
- Focus Group Sessions

II-6. Identify opportunities and barriers to the technologies

# Phase III Activities

III-1. Complete First Draft (January 18)

III-2. Complete Final Document (February 8)

# Survey Overview

Forty percent of respondents so far are from either state or federal agencies --

- Largest state contingent coming from DWR and regional water control boards
- Most federal responses from the USDA.

Twenty percent are from UC campuses, primarily Santa Barbara and Davis.

# Survey Overview

Responses also obtained from (in descending numerical order)

- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory,
- Industry (consultants),
- Nonprofit environmental organizations,
- CSU campuses, and
- JPL.

## Survey Overview

Most respondents stated –

Technologies exist to significantly improve California's water supply and management, and

Can be immediately implemented or can be commercialized/scaled up within three to five years.

# Survey Overview

The most common technologies suggested included –

- Better access to and use of data and modeling;
- Onsite monitoring of water quality and environmental conditions;
- Use of remote sensing to evaluate snowpack and other water supply conditions; and
- Water treatment technologies such as membrane filtration and desalination.

# Survey Overview

Other recommendations have included –

Increased water use efficiency (agricultural and residential),

More closely tying the price of water to actual costs.

# Survey Overview

Recommendations for state investment have varied depending on the technologies advocated by the respondents –

Sizeable minority suggested --

Minimal investment is necessary,

Main challenge is one of access to and use of data.

Surprising percentage of respondents indicated that investment in IT technologies is not necessary as they believe that adequate computing capacity already exists.

# Survey Overview

Many respondents are highly critical of existing water management policies

- Cite lack of coordination and distributed information as primary obstacles to implementation of greater efficiencies in management.

Several respondents indicated that vested interests in the current system impede or would likely impede reform efforts.

Primary barrier cited by nearly every respondent to better water management is lack of funds.